

On the Practicality of Using Intrinsic Reconfiguration As a Fault Recovery Method in Analog Systems

Garrison W. Greenwood

Department of Electrical & Computer Engineering

Portland State University

Portland, OR 97207

Keywords: evolvable hardware, fault recovery, intrinsic evolution, reconfiguration

Abstract

Evolvable hardware combines the powerful search capability of evolutionary algorithms with the flexibility of reprogrammable devices, thereby providing a natural framework for reconfiguration. This framework has generated an interest in using evolvable hardware for fault-tolerant systems because reconfiguration can effectively deal with hardware faults whenever it is impossible to provide spares. But systems cannot tolerate faults indefinitely, which means reconfiguration does have a deadline. The focus of previous evolvable hardware research relating to fault-tolerance has been primarily restricted to restoring functionality, with no real consideration of time constraints. In this paper we are concerned with evolvable hardware performing reconfiguration under deadline constraints. In particular, we investigate reconfigurable hardware that undergoes intrinsic evolution. We show that fault recovery done by intrinsic reconfiguration has some restrictions, which designers cannot ignore.

1 Introduction

Reliable systems can be depended on to provide continual service. Unfortunately, faults are inevitable, which leads to disruptions in service. One way of increasing a system's availability is to make it fault-tolerant—i.e., capable of detecting and recovering from hardware faults. Exchanging a faulty component with an operating spare is the most widely used method for hardware fault recovery [1], but it is not always possible to have redundant hardware available. For instance, the very restrictive space and weight requirements typically found on spacecraft makes it difficult to find room for spares. Reconfiguring a faulty system eliminates the need for redundant hardware, although reconfiguration does not always guarantee full functionality can be restored. Nevertheless, reconfiguration is a viable fault recovery technique for any system with limited free space.

Evolvable hardware (EHW) has emerged as a powerful method for doing original hardware design—which naturally suggests it could be equally useful for doing hardware reconfiguration. The idea behind EHW is to combine the biologically-inspired search methods of evolutionary algorithms with the flexibility of reconfigurable hardware. The evolutionary algorithm searches throughout the space of all possible configurations looking for the one that performs the best. Every configuration the evolutionary algorithm finds must be evaluated and there are two accepted methods: *extrinsic evolution* where the evaluation is done in software, and *intrinsic evolution* where the evaluation is done on a hardware implementation. In many instances intrinsic evolution is necessary because the only real way to evaluate a configuration is to implement it and have it actually operate in the physical environment. We refer to a reconfiguration search using intrinsic evolution as *intrinsic reconfiguration*. (An excellent introduction to EHW can be found in [2].)

Two types of devices are suitable reconfigurable architectures for analog systems: the field programmable analog array (FPAA) and the field programmable transistor array (FPTA). These devices represent different levels of granularity. The FPAA provides configurable blocks of circuitry along with programmable routing resources. Conversely, the FPTA consists of an array of MOSFET transistors interconnected via programmable switches. A small number of capacitors are included on-chip, but resistors are synthesized using the MOSFET transistors. FPAAs are available as commercial off-the-shelf (COTS) devices (e.g., see [3]); the FPTA was fabricated for NASA’s Jet Propulsion Laboratory and is currently only available for research studies [4].

Some recent work has shown EHW can be quite effective for reconfiguring existing hardware to overcome faults [5, 6, 7]. The ability of evolutionary algorithms to find good reconfigurations is not at issue in this paper. We instead are concerned with the issue of time. Most EHW-based studies rely on device simulators rather than physical hardware. This simulator use means the time to download a configuration, the time to program the device, and the time to conduct a fitness evaluation on the reconfigured hardware has largely been ignored—even though they dramatically affect the evolutionary algorithm’s running time.

Systems cannot operate indefinitely with faults. This means fault recovery must be completed within specified timeframes or undesirable consequences will occur. The introduction of a deadline into fault recovery means fault-tolerant systems must be considered real-time systems (RTS). Greenwood, et. al [8] were the first to suggest EHW-based reconfiguration has a time limit. In this paper it will be shown how reconfiguration time impacts the choice of a fault recovery mechanism.

2 Preliminary Definitions

This section provides a brief introduction to real-time systems. Interested readers are referred to some of the excellent books on this topic for further information (e.g., see [9]). We begin with a formal definition of a real-time system.

Definition: (real-time system)

Any system that is both logically and temporally correct

Logical correctness means the system satisfies all functional specifications. Temporal correctness means the system is guaranteed to perform these functions within explicit time-frames. Fault-tolerant systems qualify as real-time systems because fault detection and fault recovery inherently have deadlines. That is, the fault must be detected within a certain period of time after it occurs, and the fault must be corrected within a certain period of time after it is detected. Fault recovery may also have an expected start time.

The notion of real-time is often interpreted to mean really fast. This interpretation is not correct. Real-time does not necessarily mean fast—and fast does not necessarily mean real-time. Suppose a document must be sent from Chicago to London, and two delivery systems are available: surface mail with a guaranteed 3-day delivery time or e-mail with a guaranteed 5 minute delivery time. The e-mail delivery is orders of magnitude faster than surface mail, but that does not necessarily mean it qualifies as a real-time delivery system. It is the required delivery deadline that ultimately establishes whether the real-time system definition has been met. For example, both systems are real-time systems if the deadline is six days because both are logically and temporally correct. However, neither one is a real-time system if the deadline is three minutes because neither one is temporally correct.

Real-time systems are classified as hard or soft. Hard systems have catastrophic consequences if the temporal requirements are not met—up to and including complete system destruction. In fact, if the hard system is safety-critical, failure could lead to injury or even death. Conversely, soft systems only have degraded performance if the temporal requirements aren't met. The classification of a fault-tolerant system, in particular, depends on the nature of the faults and the consequences for failing to detect and correct them in a timely manner. Suppose a fault results in an over-temperature condition. If the system hardware can survive this condition for up to five minutes, then fault recovery must be completed within five minutes to prevent further damage. This would be a hard fault-tolerant system. On the other hand, if the fault only causes a minor loss of some sensor data, fault recovery could take considerably longer without dire consequences. This would be a soft fault-tolerant system.

3 Quantifying Reconfiguration Time

The main parameter we concentrate on is the programming time (t_p) for reconfigurable analog devices. Table 1 shows the programming time (t_p) for several reconfigurable devices. This programming time cannot be ignored because EHW algorithms frequently have populations sizes in the hundreds and they run for thousands of generations.

Example 1:

Suppose a proportional-derivative controller is implemented in an FPAA. A controller's fitness is found by applying a step input to the control system and then measuring its settling time. The fitness evaluation lasts at least as long as the settling time does, which can be

Device	Type	Size	Mfg	t_p (ms)	Ref.	Notes
ispPAC10	FPAA	4	Lattice Semiconductor	100	[10]	
AN220E04	FPAA	4	Anadigm	3.8	[11]	1, 2
JPL's FPTA2	FPTA	64	fabricated by MOSIS	0.008	[12]	3

- (1) All 18 banks are reloaded with 256 bytes/bank
- (2) Serial transfer with 10 MHz clock
- (3) Byte-wide transfers with 160 MHz clock

Table 1: Programming times for various popular reconfigurable analog devices. All are COTS devices except for the FPTA. The units for size are modules for FPAA's and cells for FPTA's. The references indicate where the t_p value is documented.

somewhat lengthy. Indeed, settling times of two minutes are not unheard of [13]. Under these circumstances, it wouldn't take a very large population size nor a large number of generations to make an intrinsic reconfiguration run for hours or even days before finishing.

Example 2:

An AN220E04 FPAA is used to compensate for aging effects in a control system responsible for positioning a satellite's communications antenna. The reconfiguration search is done by a generational GA run for 500 generations with a population size of 100. The system's step response is measured to determine if the compensation is correct. This step response test takes 625 milliseconds to conduct. It takes $3.8 + 625 = 628.8$ ms to reprogram the FPAA and compute the evolved compensator's fitness, but a total of 500,000 compensators are evolved during the evolutionary algorithm's run. Hence, the reconfiguration time takes ≈ 8.7 hours.

4 Discussion

Reconfiguration times are meaningless until they are put into context. For instance, take Example 2 from the previous section. Suppose brief communication sessions with the satellite are scheduled at 10 hour intervals. A session may be skipped, but skipping two sessions in a row is not permitted. If a fault is detected just prior to a scheduled session, and if the error results in missing the session, then the fault recovery deadline is 10 hours. This is the worst case scenario¹. An almost 9 hour reconfiguration time may seem quite long, but in this case it is perfectly acceptable because $T_r < 10$. On the other hand, it would not be acceptable if communication sessions were scheduled at 6 hour intervals.

The only way to determine if there is a problem is to compare the reconfiguration time against the fault recovery deadline. This latter quantity is system dependent. No problem exists so long as the reconfiguration time is less than the recovery deadline.

¹ Missing one session is permitted. If the fault is detected just after a scheduled session, the fault recovery deadline would be 20 hours.

This time comparison adds a new perspective on intrinsic evolution and, at the same time, imposes a new requirement. Reconfiguration becomes a real-time process whenever it is used as a fault recovery method. Consequently, it is no longer sufficient to just talk about how an evolutionary algorithm was able to restore a circuit’s functionality. These statements may show logical correctness, but without comparing the reconfiguration time against a deadline there is no proof of temporal correctness. Just reporting an algorithm’s running time doesn’t say anything about temporal correctness either. The key point is expressed by the following first principle:

No EHW-based recovery method can legitimately proclaim efficacy until it is proven to be both logically and temporally correct.

The validity of this principle is easy to see. If the recovery method isn’t logically correct, then the problem can’t be fixed. If it isn’t temporally correct, then the problem can’t be fixed soon enough to prevent other things from going wrong. Without proving logical and temporal correctness, there is no basis for claiming a fault recovery method is effective.

It is easy to prove if a fault recovery method is logically correct—try it and see if it fixes the problem. Proving temporal correctness, however, is more complicated because it really depends on conducting a thorough failure modes and effects analysis (FMEA). This analysis should identify all potential faults and their effects on system performance [14]. One outcome of a FMEA are the recovery deadlines. Temporal correctness is proven if a logically correct recovery is guaranteed to finish prior to the recovery deadline.

Greenwood, et. al [8] suggested evolutionary algorithms designed for reconfiguration searches perform best if they have high selection pressure and if they emphasize mutation for reproduction. In principle, any type of evolutionary algorithm could be used for a reconfiguration search, but from a practical standpoint genetic programming algorithms should be avoided. Genetic programming algorithms designed for EHW problems are put on large multiprocessor systems to abridge their long running time [15, 16]. This becomes especially problematic for fault-tolerant systems because, if there isn’t enough room for redundant hardware, then there isn’t enough room for a large multiprocessor system either. It seems unlikely a full-fledged genetic programming search, run on a single processor, could finish quickly enough to meet a fault recovery deadline of only a few hours.

5 Conclusions

EHW-based reconfiguration is a viable method of performing fault recovery in systems without redundant hardware. Fault-tolerant systems are real-time systems. Consequently, any attempts to intrinsically evolve a new hardware configuration must consider the device programming time and the fitness evaluation time because they both contribute to the reconfiguration time.

It has been shown neither a large population size nor thousands of generations are necessary to have reconfiguration searches with surprisingly long finishing times. However, a long

search time by itself is not enough to reject reconfiguration as a fault recovery method. Intrinsic reconfiguration can be used for fault recovery so long as it finishes before the mandatory recovery deadline.

References

- [1] A. Avizienis. Towards systematic design of fault-tolerant systems. *IEEE Comput.*, 30(4):51–58, 1997.
- [2] X. Yao and T. Higuchi. Promises and challenges of evolvable hardware. *IEEE Trans. Sys. Man & Cyber.*, 29(1):87–97, 1999.
- [3] AN220E04 datasheet—dynamically reconfigurable FPAA. Anadigm Inc., 2002.
- [4] A. Stoica, D. Keymeulen, R. Zebulum, A. Thakoor, T. Daud, G. Klimeck, Y. Jin, R. Tawel, and V. Duong. Evolution of analog circuits on field programmable transistor arrays. In Jason Lohn et. al, editor, *The Second NASA/DoD workshop on Evolvable Hardware*, pages 99–108, 2000.
- [5] D. Keymeulen, R. Zebulum, Y. Jin, and A. Stoica. Fault-tolerant evolvable hardware using field-programmable transistor arrays. *IEEE Trans. Reliab.*, 49(3):305–316, 2000.
- [6] D. Mange, M. Sipper, A. Stauffer, and G. Tempesti. Embryonics: a new methodology for designing field programmable gate arrays with self-repair and self-replicating properties. *Proc. of the IEEE*, 88(4):516–541, 2000.
- [7] L. Sekanina and V. Drabek. Relation between fault tolerance and reconfiguration in cellular systems. *Proc. 6th IEEE on-line testing workshop*, pages 25–30, 2000.
- [8] G. Greenwood, E. Ramsden, and S. Ahmed. An empirical comparison of evolutionary algorithms for evolvable hardware with maximum time-to-reconfigure requirements. In J. Lohn et. al, editor, *Proc. 2003 NASA/DOD Conf. on Evol. Hdwe*, pages 59–66, 2003.
- [9] A. Burns and A. Wellings. *Real-Time Systems and Programming Languages*. Addison-Wesley-Longmain, 3rd edition, 2001.
- [10] ispPAC10 in-system programmable analog circuit datasheet. Lattice Semiconductor Corp., 2000.
- [11] AN220E04 user’s manual UM020800-U002g. Anadigm Inc., 2002.
- [12] R. Zebulum, Y. Jin, and A. Stoica. JPL, private communication, 2003.
- [13] NGST yardstick mission. *NGST Monograph No. 1*, Next Generation Space Telescope Project Study Office, Goddard Space Flight Center, 1999.

- [14] Facility system safety guidebook. *NASA-STD-8719.7*, January 1998.
- [15] M. Streeter, M. Keane, and J. Koza. Routine duplication of post-2000 patented inventions by means of genetic programming. In J. Foster et.al, editor, *Genetic Programming: 5th Euro. Conf., EuroGP 2002*, pages 26–36, 2002.
- [16] M. Keane, J. Koza, and M. Streeter. Automatic synthesis using genetic programming of an improved general-purpose controller for industrially representative plants. In A. Stoica et. al, editor, *The 2002 NASA/DoD Conference on Evolvable Hardware*, pages 113–122, 2002.